

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-5 remain in the application.

In item 3 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1-5 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Examiner considered the material on lines 27-32 of claim 1 to be confusing.

Counsel requested a telephone conference with the Examiner, and the Examiner kindly granted the request after a brief delay to retrieve the case. Applicants are appreciative of the additional effort of the Examiner.

Counsel explained that according to claim 1, a comparator unit will supply an event signal depending on the signal levels received from the storage elements. In the case where the signal levels received from the storage elements are identical, a comparator unit will supply an event signal that is different than the event signal that will be supplied by

the comparator unit when two different signal levels are received from the storage elements.

During the telephone conference, the Examiner indicated that the meaning now seemed to be clear, and that counsel should reference the discussion when responding to the outstanding Office action.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved.

The Examiner stated that claims 1-5 would be allowed if the 35 U.S.C. § 112 were overcome.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, he is respectfully requested to telephone counsel so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark F. Weichselbaum
Reg. No. 43,248

For Applicant

MPW:cgm

November 26, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101

[illegible]

Docket
2003

I

Client Cheryl Williams Serial No 9172420

Serial No.

Claim Involved _____